

up where the Clinton administration left off because the Clinton administration obtained the framework agreement that resulted in the canning of that very material which is so dangerous which contains plutonium. Within 24 hours, at the summit the next day, President Bush basically said: We are not going to have any discussions with North Korea. We are not picking up where the Clinton administration left off. We do not trust North Korea.

No kidding. That is a mild statement, that we do not trust North Korea. If we did not talk to people we did not trust, we would not be talking to half of the world, including some of the most dangerous people in the world.

Talking to people does not mean we are going to reward anything. It simply means they will hear directly, eyeball to eyeball, from us as to what our concerns are, and also why we do not threaten them, and why, if they will terminate their nuclear program, they can rest assured they will get an agreement from us that there is not going to be any active aggression against them.

The blowing hot and cold, the erratic policy, the undermining not just of our own Secretary of State 24 hours after he said we would continue a policy, but undermining our South Korean allies with so much at stake, it seems to me has contributed to a very uncertain policy on the Korean peninsula, has sowed the seeds of confusion, and fueled and contributed to the paranoia that already existed in spades in North Korea.

I have been to Yongbyon, the place in North Korea where they were canning those fuel rods, where they had sealed them. I don't know that any other Member of the Congress got there, but I got there a couple years ago. I watched the International Atomic Energy Agency as they were sealing those fuel rods. That was a very positive thing to watch, to actually see, under IAEA inspection and supervision, those incredibly dangerous nuclear materials being canned instead of threatening to the rest of the world as potential proliferated material, to actually see it put under the supervision of the IAEA.

That is now out the window. We are starting from scratch. I understate my feelings on the matter when I say the Senator, the Democratic leader here, has so accurately stated the fact that we have a problem. Step 1 is to recognize we indeed have a crisis. Step 2 is not just to consult with allies but to seriously consider what they recommend when they talk about having direct engagement with the North Koreans.

I thank the Democratic leader for his constant determination to keep this Korean peninsula crisis in front of us. We cannot lose sight of it. It is a greater threat than Iraq because in North Korea you have a known proliferator who has removed the inspectors and who has nuclear material which could

be so easily distributed, shipped, or sold to people who could do great harm with it.

I thank my friend from South Dakota.

Mr. DASCHLE. I thank the distinguished Senator from Michigan.

We can learn a lot from history. History, for most of my lifetime, involved a cold war, a cold war with an arch-enemy—the Soviet Union—which had thousands of nuclear warheads pointed toward the United States. They posed an imminent threat that could at any moment destroy all of civilization.

We made the choice, for good reason, Republican and Democratic administrations made the choice, that rather than engage in conflict, we would contain, negotiate, disarm, and ultimately wear down those leaders of the Soviet Union. That is ultimately what happened. The Soviet Union collapsed, negotiations for disarmament continued, and I recognize the contribution of many Presidents, from Harry Truman on.

But it was Ronald Reagan who said: Trust but verify. He did not say: I don't trust the Soviet Union, so I'm not going to enter into dialog with them. He was criticized at times, but he said: I'm going to engage in dialog. I'm going to continue the effort of my predecessors. I'm going to trust. But then I'm going to verify.

What the Senator from Michigan noted is that a couple of years ago that verification process was underway. We trusted. And we verified. His site visit was an indication of that verification.

I can only hope that those responsible for the day-to-day decisions made with regard to U.S. foreign policy will recognize the importance of past precedent, that we engage our enemies, we engage those whom there is ample reason to distrust, but we recognize that without some communication, without some engagement, the only other option is conflict.

The only other option is to see what is happening today. Nuclear weapons are being constructed. Nuclear weapons are being stockpiled. Nuclear weapons could be shipped. Nuclear weapons could be used not only in the region but against this country, as well. Every day we delay, every day we lack the will to confront and communicate, every day we lack the desire to verify, every day we create a problem more complex for future leaders and for future American policy.

I hope this administration will very carefully reconsider their position. I hope they will listen to our allies. I hope they will engage the North Koreans. I hope they can give us greater appreciation with greater clarity of their intentions with regard to that part of the world.

I yield the floor.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now return to legislative session and go into a period of morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHAMBLISS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

IRAQ

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, this morning's Washington Post has an especially long editorial. Indeed, it takes up the entire length of the editorial page. It is entitled "Drumbeat on Iraq, a Response to Readers."

I have a dear friend in Utah who wrote me. She was distraught—is distraught, I am sure—about the prospect of going to war and expressed a great many concerns. I have been in the process of constructing what I hope is a responsible and thoughtful response to her concerns. As I read the editorial in this morning's Washington Post, I found that it does a better job than I could do of summarizing many, if not most, of the issues about which she is concerned. I want to read from sections of the editorial and then ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at the end of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. BENNETT. In the editorial they say:

The right question, though, is not, "Is war risky?" but "Is inaction less so?" No one can provide more than a judgment in reply. But the world is already a dangerous place. Anthrax has been wielded in Florida, New York and Washington. Terrorists have struck repeatedly and with increased strength over the past decade. Are the United States and its allies ultimately safer if they back down again and leave Saddam Hussein secure? Or does safety lie in making clear that his kind of outlaw behavior will not be tolerated and in helping Iraq become a peaceable nation that offers no haven to terrorists? We would say the latter. . . .

As I say, I could not have put it better, which is why I have quoted it. I have raised the question on the floor before: What are the consequences if we do not follow through in Iraq? Some have said let's just leave the troops in place. And that means Iraq remains contained.

Leaving the troops in place is not an option. We must understand that the troops are where they are, poised to move into Iraq, because of the agreement of the governments in Qatar, Turkey, and Saudi Arabia, among others. Those governments will not allow our troops to remain on their soil indefinitely. They will not allow those troops to remain there while we contain Saddam Hussein for 6 months or 12 months or 12 years, which has been the period of "containment" that we have seen up until now. We must either withdraw those troops and say we are

not going to move ahead militarily or, if Saddam Hussein does not disarm in accordance with the U.N. resolutions, those troops will move forward into his territory. We have no other choice: Move forward or withdraw.

For those who say the inspectors should be allowed to do their job, we must understand that the only reason the inspectors are there is because the troops are there. So we are coming down to the decision point, that is very clear.

Again, back to the editorial:

Some argue now that, because Saddam Hussein has not in the intervening half decade used his arsenal, Mr. Clinton was wrong.

I should say that the editorial quotes President Clinton as outlining the case against Saddam Hussein in 1998.

Some would argue now that, because Saddam Hussein has not in the intervening half decade used his arsenal, Mr. Clinton was wrong and the world can rest assured that Iraq is adequately "contained." Given what we know about how containment erodes over time; about Saddam Hussein's single-mindedness compared with the inattention and divisions of other nations; and about the ease with which deadly weapons can move across borders, we do not trust such an assurance. Mr. Clinton understood, as Mr. Bush understands, that no president can bet his nation's safety on the hope that Iraq is "contained." We respect our readers who believe that war is the worst option. But we believe that, in this case, long-term peace will be better served by strength than by concessions.

There is one other issue that was raised by my friend in Utah to which the editorial does not speak. This is the issue of first strike. My friend says we cannot cross the line of having the United States be involved in a first strike against a nation that has not attacked us.

One of the arguments I have heard on this score is that if we do it, we will set a precedent that will allow other nations to do it. Other nations that we do not want to do it will say we can do it because the United States did.

If I may, without being disrespectful to that argument, I would point out that Adolph Hitler did not need a precedent from the United States to attack Poland. He made up his own excuse. He pretended that Poland had attacked him. He dressed prisoners in Polish military uniforms, murdered them, and then had them found by German soldiers on German soil who said they were shot as they tried to invade Germany.

The setting of a precedent by the United States or the not setting of a precedent by the United States will have absolutely no effect on the actions of a brutal dictator who decides to attack his neighbors in a first strike fashion. Saddam Hussein didn't quote precedent when he attacked Kuwait in the early 1990s. He went ahead and did it, and would have done it again whether he had precedent or not.

Having said that, however, I want to review a little bit of American history. It may not be history of which we are proud, for those who say we have never

committed a first strike, but it is history nonetheless of which we must be aware. I have not taken the time to research all examples of this because my memory provides me with enough to make the point.

I remember when Lyndon Johnson sent the Marines into the Dominican Republic, for what purpose I cannot recall. But this was not a country that had attacked us and we sent military forces in there on the grounds that there was some American interest that had to be protected.

Ronald Reagan sent the Marines into Grenada. His reason was that the legitimate Government of Grenada requested it.

In his book, "The Rise and Fall of the Soviet Empire," Brian Crozier referred to the American military action in Grenada as one of the key turning points in the cold war. He said if the United States had not moved into Grenada and removed the Communist government there, the cold war would have lasted considerably longer and been more devastating.

There was no international clamor against President Reagan when he did this. He believed it was in America's best interests, and at least one historian has said it was not only in America's best interests, it was in the world's best interests for Ronald Reagan to have done what he did in Grenada.

In the waning days of his Presidency, the first President Bush sent American troops into Somalia. Somalia had not attacked us and did not represent any threat. The troops were there presumably on a humanitarian mission, but they were sent in to deal with a military situation in that country that President Bush thought had to be dealt with. Those troops were withdrawn by the Clinton administration. But, once again, this was not a circumstance where America had been attacked but one where an American President sent American troops and there was no international outcry, no international complaint.

Shortly after I came to the Senate, President Clinton invaded Haiti. Our former colleague, Sam Nunn, was in Haiti just prior to the time when the American military entered that country, and he debriefed a number of us after he came back. He pointed out that the only reason there was not bloodshed when the American troops entered Haiti was because the former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Colin Powell, went with Senator Nunn and former President Jimmy Carter to Haiti and General Powell was able to convince the Haitian general in charge of their military that it was not dishonorable for the Haitian general to save the lives of his troops and allow the Americans to come in without military opposition.

As I recall it from Senator Nunn, the Haitian general was determined that it was his duty as a military man to resist any invasion of his country, no

matter how hopeless that resistance might be. And he gathered his family around him, his wife and his children, hugged them together and said: This is our last night on Earth because tomorrow the Americans are invading and I will be killed.

As I say, General Powell sat down with the Haitian general, convinced him that his first duty as a military officer was to protect the lives of his troops, and that he was not doing a dishonorable thing if he did not mount a hopeless resistance against the Americans.

Once again, there was no international outcry against the American decision to send troops into Haiti. Looking back on it, it was not necessarily a wise thing to have done. We replaced a brutal dictator much beloved by American conservatives with a brutal dictator much beloved by American liberals. But the average Haitian has not seen any improvement in his or her lifestyle. Indeed, those who have been to Haiti recently tell me things are worse now than they were before the Americans invaded.

Then we have the former Yugoslavia, a country that represented no threat to the United States and had not attacked the United States, but the United States led a national coalition in war upon that nation.

Why did we do it? We did it because, under Milosevic, that nation had produced enough casualties within its borders to begin to approach 20 percent of the size of the Holocaust. They killed that many of their own people, and the Americans felt that was a serious enough challenge to require us to go ahead.

Now we have just heard a speech by the Senator from Michigan with respect to North Korea. We are being asked, Why are we not doing more with respect to North Korea? I will not respond to the Senator from Michigan or the Democratic leader in that vein. But I will point out that the attitude around the world and, indeed, here in the Senate is why the United States isn't taking care of this. If I might add one word to that question, Why isn't the United States taking care of this unilaterally? In other words, the United States should handle this all by themselves, according to speeches that are made here and in the world community.

I run through this history simply to make this point: It is not accurate to say the proposed action in Iraq is either unprecedented in American history or illegal under American or international law. The action that is proposed with respect to Iraq is in the tradition of these humanitarian missions that I have described.

Some of them have gone wrong. Some of them have turned out not to produce a humanitarian result. But in every case there was no prior complaint raised against the proposal that we do this on the ground that this was an unacceptable first strike against a

defenseless neighbor. In every circumstance, it went forward with full approval. I voted against the move into Haiti. But the President appropriately came to the Congress and got approval before he did it.

President Bush has come to the Congress, and by a 77-23 vote in this body and an equally lopsided vote in the other body, has approval before he goes into Iraq. This is not a stealth attack like Pearl Harbor under the cover of night. This is something that has been debated and laid before the United Nations. The United Nations, by a 15-0 vote in the Security Council, announced to Iraq if she did not disarm, she would face serious consequences, and serious consequences in United Nations speak means war. This is not something that is done hidden or in a corner or in the dark.

So we come back now to the fundamental question: Is it safer to go ahead with an operation in Iraq than it is to pull down the American troops and bring them home? I agree with the editorial writers of the Washington Post. This is an agonizing decision. This is not one to be made lightly, and I am sure from conversations with him that the President is not going to make it lightly. He is going to weigh all of the consequences. But I believe in the end he will come to the same conclusion that the Washington Post editorial writers have come to and that I have come to. Whatever the unknowns on either side, the present evidence suggests that the most dangerous thing we could do with respect to the situation in Iraq is to back down if Iraq does not comply with the United Nations resolution. To pull our troops out of Iraq does not comply with the demands that the world has made upon it. The safest thing to do if Iraq does not comply is to carry through with the resolution that was adopted on this floor by an overwhelming margin, adopted in the Security Council of the United Nations unanimously, and not hold back.

I yield the floor.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 27, 2003]

"DRUMBEAT" ON IRAQ? A RESPONSE TO READERS

"I have been a faithful reader of The Washington Post for almost 10 years," a recent e-mail to this page begins. "Recently, however, I have grown tired of your bias and endless drumbeating for war in Iraq." He's not the only one. The national and international debate over Saddam Hussein's weapons of mass destruction, and our editorials in favor of disarming the dictator, have prompted a torrent of letters, many approving and many critical. They are for the most part thoughtful and serious; the antiwar letters in particular are often angry and anguished as well. "It is truly depressing to witness the depths Washington Post editors have reached in their jingoistic rush to war," another reader writes. It's a serious charge, and it deserves a serious response.

That answer, given the reference to "Washington Post editors," probably needs to begin with a restatement of the separation at The Post between news and editorial opinion functions. Those of us who write editorials have no influence over editors and re-

porters who cover the news and who are committed to offering the fairest and most complete journalism possible about the standoff with Iraq. They in turn have no influence over us.

For our part, we might begin with that phrase "rush to war." In fact there is nothing sudden or precipitous about our view that Saddam Hussein poses a grave danger. In 1990 and 1991 we supported many months of diplomacy and pressure to persuade the Iraqi dictator to withdraw his troops from Kuwait, the neighboring country he had invaded. When he failed to do so, we supported the use of force to restore Kuwait's independence. While many of the same Democrats who oppose force now opposed it then also, we believe war was the correct option—though it was certainly not, at the time, the only choice. When the war ended, we supported—in hindsight too unquestioningly—a cease-fire agreement that left Saddam Hussein in power. But it was an agreement, imposed by the U.N. Security Council, that demanded that he give up his dangerous weapons.

In 1997 and 1998, we strongly backed President Clinton when he vowed that Iraq must finally honor its commitments to the United Nations to give up its nuclear, biological and chemical weapons—and we strongly criticized him when he retreated from those vows. Mr. Clinton understood the stakes. Iraq, he said, was a "rogue state with weapons of mass destruction, ready to use them or provide them to terrorists, drug traffickers or organized criminals who travel the world among us unnoticed."

When we cite Mr. Clinton's perceptive but ultimately empty comments, it is in part to chide him and other Democrats who take a different view now that a Republican is in charge. But it has a more serious purpose too. Mr. Clinton could not muster the will, or the domestic or international support, to force Saddam Hussein to live up to the promises he had made in 1991, though even then the danger was well understood. Republicans who now line up behind President Bush were in many cases particularly irresponsible; when Mr. Clinton did bomb Iraqi weapons sites in 1998, some GOP leaders accused him of seeking only to distract the nation from his impeachment worries. Through the end of Mr. Clinton's tenure and the first year of Mr. Bush's presidency, Saddam Hussein built up his power, beat back sanctions and found new space to rearm—all with the support of France and Russia and the acquiescence of the United States.

After Sept. 11, 2001, many people of both parties said—and we certainly hoped—that the country had moved beyond such failures of will and politicization of deadly foreign threats. An outlaw dictator, in open defiance of U.N. resolutions, unquestionably possessing and pursuing biological and chemical weapons, expressing support for the Sept. 11 attacks: Surely the nation would no longer dither in the face of such a menace. Now it seems again an open question. To us, risks that were clear before seem even clearer now.

But what of our "jingoism," our "drumbeating"? Probably no editorial page sin could be more grievous than whipping up war fever for some political or trivial purpose. And we do not take lightly the risks of war—to American and Iraqi soldiers and civilians first of all. We believe that the Bush administration has only begun to prepare the public for the sacrifices that the nation and many young Americans might bear during and after a war. And there is a long list of terrible things that could go wrong: anthrax dispersed, moderate regimes imperiled, Islamist recruiting spurred, oil wells set afire.

The first question, though, is not "Is war risky?" but "Is inaction less so?" No one can provide more than a judgment in reply. But the world is already a dangerous place. Anthrax has been wielded in Florida, New York and Washington. Terrorists have struck repeatedly and with increasing strength over the past decade. Are the United States and its allies ultimately safer if they back down again and leave Saddam Hussein secure? Or does safety lie in making clear that his kind of outlaw behavior will not be tolerated and in helping Iraq become a peaceable nation that offers no haven to terrorists? We would say the latter while acknowledging the magnitude of the challenge, both during and especially after any war that may have to be fought. And we would say also that not only terrible things are possible: To free the Iraqi people from the sadistic repression of Saddam Hussein, while not the primary goal of a war, would surely be a blessing.

Nor is it useful merely to repeat that war "should only be a last resort," as the latest French-German-Russian resolution states, or that, as French President Jacques Chirac said Monday, Iraq must disarm "because it represents a danger for the region and maybe the world . . . But we believe this disarmament must happen peacefully." Like everyone else, we hope it does happen peacefully. But if it does not—if Saddam Hussein refuses as he has for a dozen years—should that refusal be accommodated?

War in fact has rarely been the last resort for the United States. In very recent times, the nation could have allowed Saddam Hussein to swallow Kuwait. It could have allowed Slobodan Milosevic to expel 1 million refugees from Kosovo. In each case, the nation and its allies fought wars of choice. Even the 2001 campaign against Afghanistan was not a "last resort," though it is now remembered as an inevitable war of self-defense. Many Americans argued that the Taliban had not attacked the United States and should not be attacked; that what was needed was a police action against Osama bin Laden. We believed they were wrong and Mr. Bush was right, though he will be vindicated in history only if the United States and its allies stay focused on Afghanistan and its reconstruction.

So the real questions are whether every meaningful alternative has been exhausted, and if so whether war is wise as well as justified. The risks should be minimized. Everyone agrees, for example, that the United States would be stronger before and during a war if jointed by many allies, and even better positioned if backed by the United Nations. If waiting a month, or three months, would ensure such backing, the wait would be worthwhile.

But the history is not encouraging. The Security Council agreed unanimously in early November that Iraq was a danger; that inspectors could do no more than verify a voluntary disarmament; and that a failure to disarm would be considered a "material breach." Now all agree that Saddam Hussein has not cooperated, and yet some countries balk at the consequences—as they have, time and again, since 1991. We have seen no evidence that an additional three months would be helpful. Nor does it strike us as serious to argue that the war should be fought if Mr. Chirac and German Chancellor Gerhard Schroeder agree, but not if they do not. If the war is that optional, it should not be fought, even if those leaders do agree; if it is essential to U.S. national security, their objections ultimately cannot be dispositive.

In 1998, Mr. Clinton explained to the nation why U.S. national security was, in fact, in danger. "What if he fails to comply and we fail to act, or we take some ambiguous third route, which gives him yet more opportunities to develop this program of weapons of

mass destruction? . . . Well, he will conclude that the international community has lost its will. He will then conclude that he can go right on and do more to rebuild an arsenal of devastating destruction. And some day, some way, I guarantee you he'll use the arsenal."

Some argue now that, because Saddam Hussein has not in the intervening half-decade use his arsenal, Mr. Clinton was wrong and the world can rest assured that Iraq is adequately "contained." Given what we know about how containment erodes over time; about Saddam Hussein's single-mindedness compared with the inattention and divisions of other nations; and about the ease with which deadly weapons can move across borders, we do not trust such an assurance. Mr. Clinton understood, as Mr. Bush understands, that no president can bet his nation's safety on the hope that Iraq is "contained." We respect our readers who believe that war is the worst option. But we believe that, in this case, long-term peace will be better served by strength than by concessions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I send a resolution to the desk and ask unanimous consent that it be held at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SANTORUM. Thank you, Mr. President.

FRED McFEELY ROGERS

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, it is with great sadness that I rise tonight on the Senate floor to talk about the life of Fred Rogers from my hometown of Pittsburgh, PA. Mr. Rogers died today of stomach cancer. It is a very sad time for all of us—at least to my generation—who remembers Mr. Rogers from public television, and certainly from my experience with him and the wonderful work that he did for children not just all over the country, frankly, but all over the world, certainly, and very importantly to the people of southwestern Pennsylvania.

In fact, I had the pleasure and the honor of having lunch with him in the Senate dining room just a couple of months ago around Christmas before he found out that he was stricken with stomach cancer. He was here to talk about, predictably, what we can and should be doing to help create a culture that is more nurturing to children in the United States of America.

In times when just about every figure in public life has some controversy surrounding them, he is someone who throughout his life escaped that controversy and stood as a beacon of caring, compassion, and thoughtfulness to parents and children alike.

Mr. Rogers was born in Latrobe, PA, south side of Pittsburgh in 1928. He married his wife 51 years ago, back in 1952. His wife Joanne survives him today.

Very early in his career he had a gift for the media and a heart for trying to reach children and touch children and educate and nurture children through

the media. He worked in a variety of different things. But in 1966, he created and hosted "Mr. Rogers' Neighborhood." Before that, he worked on a series in Canada for the CBC. And he worked at WQED, which is one of the first public broadcasting stations in the country.

We are very honored that WQED is in Pittsburgh. We are also very proud of the fact that the first radio station in the country was KDKA in Pittsburgh.

We in Pittsburgh are very proud of WQED and the great work that Fred Rogers did in putting together the first children's program there. Even before it was on the air he started producing programming for that station. I think it was called "The Children's Corner." It became known almost 10 years later, in 1966, as "Mr. Rogers' Neighborhood." It was actually created back in 1955. There were characters such as "Daniel S. Striped Tiger," "X the Owl," "King Friday XIII," "Henrietta Pussycat," and "Lady Elaine Fairchild."

For many of these characters, we have puppets in my conference room to celebrate the contribution Fred Rogers has made not just to the people of Pennsylvania but to the people of this country.

And that program, "Mister Rogers' Neighborhood," had the very famous song: "Won't you be my neighbor?" and Mr. Rogers coming in, and putting on that cardigan sweater and tennis shoes, inviting you into his home, the "Land of Make Believe," and the trolley. All of those things are such wonderful memories for me and for generations, and which is continuing today. Even though the program has now been out of production for a couple of years, there are over 900 episodes of "Mister Rogers' Neighborhood" that PBS has and distributes on a regular basis all over the country.

Mr. Rogers will continue to touch future generations of children, particularly young children, in that nurturing and reassuring way he had with the very young. In many cases, a lot of kids sit in front of television; mom is busy; dad is at work; or mom and dad are both at work. And there was always a reassuring and comforting voice, someone who reassured them of their values as a person, their own self-worth, their ability to accomplish things, to dream great dreams.

Mr. Rogers—in a culture that is not always so positive, and certainly not very reassuring—was just that. He was a positive example of what a good father, a good parent, can and should be, and what good adults and what adults generally can be to our children in his neighborhood—I would argue, in our neighborhood—and that we, too, can learn from Fred Rogers, can learn from the kindness and the gentility and the wholesomeness he showed to America's children and to America's parents.

We will miss Fred Rogers. I can tell you, Pittsburgh is going to greatly miss this legend in our town. All of those shows were filmed in Pittsburgh,

PA, at WQED. And his neighborhood, which is the Oakland, Shadyside, and Squirrel Hill, which is where WQED is located, where much, I am sure, of his ideas came from, is a place that is lesser today than it was yesterday because of this great man passing.

But the joy in getting up and talking about Fred Rogers is what he has left. Oh, that all of us could say we have touched so many and influenced, in such a positive way, literally millions of children in this country and around the world and have made a positive contribution in serving this country.

Fred Rogers was a Presbyterian minister who found that God's calling to him was to serve children through the media. And I think God, this morning, when he arrived in Heaven, said: Well done, my good and faithful servant.

Mr. REID. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SANTORUM. I am happy to yield.

Mr. REID. The Senator is absolutely right, Mr. Rogers is somebody we all knew, you in a little bit of a different reference than I because you really did know him. But the fact that the Senator from Pennsylvania actually knew him does not mean that the rest of us did not really know him. He was a unique individual, as you said. He walked in, put on that sweater, with that very bad voice that we all remember.

The reason I wanted to interrupt the Senator before he went to the closing script is this has been a contentious week in the Senate, and I could not think of a more peaceful man to end the week than Fred Rogers. So I appreciate very much the Senator coming to the floor as quickly as he did, upon the death of this wonderful man, and ending the Senate today with memories of a peacemaker.

Mr. SANTORUM. I thank the Senator from Nevada.

I want to share another moment where I had a chance to be with Fred Rogers. And it was—oh, I wish I could remember exactly how many years ago it was. It was probably about a dozen or so years ago, give or take a couple years.

Every year, in Pennsylvania, the business world and the political world, right before Christmas, goes up to New York for the Pennsylvania Society. It has been going on now for over 100 years.

There is a dinner on a Saturday night. The industrialists used to go up there to that with their families and friends. And it has turned into a big event, a bipartisan political event as well as a business event. We have a big dinner. I think we are the longest running annual dinner at the Waldorf Astoria. It has been for over a 100 years now.

I remember they give a gold medal to a famous Pennsylvanian. One of the years I happened to be there, in the late 1980s, it was Fred Rogers who received that award. He got up to speak.